

10/823,246

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office action dated April 5, 2007. Claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice. In addition, new claims 9-13 have been added. These amendments are sourced from the original specification and drawings of the present application, thus no new matter is added. Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are pending in the application. Applicant appreciates Examiner's thorough search and review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the recited invention fails to disclose that the method is executable by a processor or a computer; therefore the invention is inoperative.

In response to this rejection, applicant has amended claim 6 by reciting that the method thereof is computer-enabled, and by including materials of hardware or a combination of hardware and software into the claim. All this has been done at least for the purpose of overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. Amended claim 6 recites the use of certain technology such as various software modules (i.e. an information maintaining module, an enterprise records posting module, a contract records posting module, and a material records posting module). The software modules are installed in a computer (i.e., an enterprise server). The method necessarily requires a computer (i.e., the enterprise server, a customs server) and/or a computer-readable medium (i.e., a database). That is, the method can only be performed by carrying out one or more steps of providing various software modules (see above) in a piece of

10/823,246

hardware (i.e., the enterprise server), by providing client computers, and by having the customs server and the database available. Accordingly, it is submitted that amended claim 6 now complies with 35 U.S.C. §101. Since claims 7-8 depend from amended independent claim 6, claims 7-8 should also comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barry et al. (US Publication 2004/0205659, hereinafter referred to as "Barry").

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Including having regard to the objection to claim 4, applicant has amended claim 1 by, inter alia, incorporating the substance of the subject matter of claim 4 thereinto. Accordingly, claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice. Further, applicant has amended claim 6 by, inter alia, incorporating subject matter thereinto, which subject matter corresponds to the subject matter of claim 4.

Based on these amendments, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-8. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections.

10/823,246

Claims 1-5

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

'an enterprise records posting sub-module for generating enterprise records according to the information on the enterprise;
a contract records posting sub-module for generating contract records according to information on respective contracts; and
a material records posting sub-module for generating material records according to information on respective materials'.

Amended claim 1 is substantially the equivalent of claim 4 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. That is, the features of "*an enterprise records posting sub-module for generating enterprise records according to the information on the enterprise; a contract records posting sub-module for generating contract records according to information on respective contracts; and a material records posting sub-module for generating material records according to information on respective materials*" are now included in claim 1. Thus, amended claim 1 should be not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Barry, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Barry. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Since claims 2-3 and 5 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1 and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 2-3 and 5 should also be allowable.

Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice, therefore the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

10/823,246

Claims 6-8

Claim 6, as amended, recites in part:

“providing an enterprise records posting module in the enterprise server for generating enterprise records according to information on the enterprise, the enterprise records forming part of the corresponding records;

providing a contract records posting module in the enterprise server for generating contract records according to information on respective contracts, the contract records forming part of the corresponding records;

providing a material records posting module in the enterprise server for generating material records according to information on respective materials, the material records forming part of the corresponding records”.

Amended claim 6 is a method claim corresponding to the system for posting records in customs of amended claim 1. Referring to the above reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, applicant submits that for similar reasons, Barry fails to disclose, teach or even suggest the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 6. That is, amended claim 6 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Barry, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Barry. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 6 are requested.

Since claims 7-8 depend from amended independent claim 6, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 7-8 should also be allowable.

10/823,246

In addition, applicant has added new claims 9-13. Claim 9 is an independent claim that includes, inter alia, all of the subject matter of claim 4. Claim 9 is similar to amended claim 1. Referring to the above reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, applicant submits that for similar reasons, Barry fails to disclose, teach or even suggest the present invention having the features as set forth in claim 9. That is, claim 9 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Barry, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Barry. It is submitted that claims 9-13 represent patentable subject matter.

Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9, and respectively recite additional subject matter. It is submitted that claims 10-13 also represent patentable subject matter.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Xuemin Fang

By


Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137